Please Keep for Reference.

Facts for the People

No. 4.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Purity of Administration — Condemn Corruption	2
For Responsible Government — Independence of Parliament	2
The McGreevy-Langevin Boodling	2
Facts connected with the Dredging Contract	3
Dredging of the Wet Basin	3
Levis Graving Dock	4
The Cross-Wall Contract	4
The Esquimalt Dock	4
Government Corruption	5
Langevin's Guilt	5
One Law for the Rich, Another for the Poor	6
The Curran Bridge Steal	6
Samples of Curran Bridge Wages	7
The Caron Scandal	9
Caron's Confession	10
Gross Corruption	10
Caron Whitewashed	11
Whitewashed Again	11
Section "B" Scandal	12
The Harris Land Job	12
The Tay Canal	13
Little Rapids Lock—Estimate, $44,000; Actual Cost, $300,000	14
Galops Channel—Estimate, $300,000; Expenditure, $900,000	15
Sheik's Island Dam	15
St. Charles Branch	16
How to Vote	16

MARCH 1st, 1896.

Copies of this pamphlet can be had from Alexander Smith, Secretary Ontario Liberal Association, 34 Victoria Street, Toronto.

Purity of Administration—Condemn Corruption.

That the Convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The Government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys of which the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrongdoing. We arraign the Government for retaining in office a Minister of the Crown proved to have accepted very large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions, to him, a member of the Government, with one hand, was receiving Government subsidies with the other.

The conduct of the Minister and the approval of his collegues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world and deserve the severe condemnation of the people.—*Resolution No. 3, Liberal Platform*).

For Responsible Government—Independence of Parliament.

That the Convention regrets that by the action of Ministers and their supporters in Parliament, in one case in which serious charges were made against a Minister of the Crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the Ministry, contrary to the well settled practice of Parliament; and this Convention affirms:

That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the Crown, and the reference of such matters to royal commissions created upon the advice of the accused is at variance with the due responsibility of Ministers to the House of Commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the House over the Executive Government, and this Convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld.—(*Resolution No. 5 Liberal Platform*).

The McGreevy-Langevin Boodling.

The Quebec Harbor Works consisted of a dredging contract in the wet basin and tidal dock, a graving dock, a cross-wall contract, and a south wall contract.

The construction of those works and the expenditure of the moneys were to be under the control and upon the responsibility of the Minister of Public Works alone. The Quebec Harbor Commission, the majority of whose members were appointed by the Government, had something to do with the works, but all the money came from the Dominion Government. The Government had to do with the plans and the letting and approval of the contracts, and, to quote the words of the Act, "and any moneys to be hereafter paid to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall be so paid from time to time as the work proceeds upon the report of the Minister of Public Works." The Department let the contracts and the works were carried to completion under the immediate supervision of the Minister and his officials.

These works were all constructed by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., consisting of Patrick Larkin, N. K. Connolly, Michael Connolly, Owen E. Murphy. Robert H. McGreevy was given an interest in the profits of the firm in nearly every one of these contracts for the purpose of procuring the interest of his brother, the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, and through him of Sir Hector Langevin, then Minister of Public Works. Up to 1889, Robert McGreevy was confidental agent for his brother Thomas and the manager of his private affairs. Thomas McGreevy and Sir Hector Langevin had been for a life-time intimate friends, and while in Ottawa during the session, representing Quebec West in the House of Commons, Thomas McGreevy lived with Sir Hector, to whom he had loaned $10,000 and never asked it back.

Between 1878 and 1891, inclusive, this firm received in public money $3,138,234, for which they did $2,000,000 worth of work. They expended in bribery and corruption $170,447 according to their own books. Robert McGreevy, who contributed no capital

PB150 179

to the firm received as his share of the profits $187,800. The Hon Thomas McGreevy received very large sums of money from the firm, and according to the sworn evidence, Sir Hector Langevin received $10,000.

Thomas McGreevy admitted receiving $60,000 but the accountants who examined the books of the firm showed that at least $130,000 passed into the hands of Thomas McGreevy.

Thomas McGreevy explained that he received this vast sum of money in his capacity as treasurer for the Conservative party in the district of Quebec, but he refused to say to whom he had given the money, and when threatened with punishment for contempt of Parliament if he did not tell, skipped out.

Evidence showed that out of this fund Thomas McGrcevy paid $25,000 to subsidize the personal newspaper organ of the Minister of Public Works, a paper in which Sir Hector had the controlling interest.

As near as could be judged from the evidence, Thomas McGreevy handled $170,000 out of the money stolen from the people, and according to his own evidence as well as that of others, he disbursed it for the benefit of the Consertative party in the elections.

FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE DREDGING CONTRACT.

In this contract Robert McGreevy was given an interest of 30 per cent. It was to terminate in 1884, but was continued until near the end of 1886. There was a lot of underhand work in procuring the contract, such as the putting of a bogus tender in the name of Beaucage, and the freezing out of contractor Askwith, and the dismissal of Kinniple and Morris, the engineers, who were replaced by engineers chosen by McGreevy, namely by Perley and Boyd, both engineers in the Public Works Department.

FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE DREDGING OF THE WET BASIN.

In the winter of 1886-7 Thomas McGreevy made an arrangement with Larkin, Connolly & Co., whereby the firm undertook to pay him $25,000 on condition that he would obtain for them the sum of 35 cents a yard for the dredging of 800,000 cubic yards, though McGreevy knew, as the leading member of the Quebec Harbor Commission, that dredging of the same kind, and even of a more difficult kind, had before been executed for 27 cents a yard and for less. This was in December, 1886, or January, 1887, when Thomas McGreevy wanted money for the Dominion elections, which took place February 22nd, 1887. This agreement was in writing and was produced at the investigation. The Government, of course, knowing the need of money in the elections, gave the contract at this scandalously high rate, enabling the contractors to make on this one item alone a profit of $174,787, and in due course Mr. McGreevy, as treasurer for the Conservative party, received $25,000. Mr. McGreevy used $5,000 of this in his own election.

Mr. Valin, who was chairman of the Harbor Commission, swore that he conferred with the Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector Langevin, with reference to this contract for dredging, and the Minister told him that he had spoken of it to Mr. McGreevy and that it was all right. Mr. Valin spoke to the Minister on several occasions and said that on each occasion the Minister had told him to follow Mr. McGreevy and everything would be all right. The Minister had added, "You know that we meet frequently and that we consult together." On one occasion when the chairman of the commission asked the Minister whether he did well in following the advice of Mr. McGreevy, the Minister had said: "If the commission does not act properly I shall dissolve it."

Under this contract enormous sums of public money were paid beyond what the work was worth, and a sum of $22,500 contrary to the terms of the contract. Sir Hector Langevin and his colleagues in the council were responsible for this and for all the other scandals. Mr. Dobell, one of the Harbor Commissioners and a leading Conservative in Quebec, protested against the dredging contract, but was overruled. In his evidence he said: "I never knew a man that seemed to be able to take in every detail as completely as Sir Hector Langevin did in these works, and he did not seem to neglect it. He seemed to be familiar with them all."

FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE CONTRACT FOR THE LEVIS GRAVING DOCK.

Thomas McGreevy agreed with the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. to secure them the contract for the completion of the graving dock at Levis, on condition that he should receive all over $50,000 of the contract price. The Government gave them the contract and they paid McGreevy $22,000. The profit on this contract was $125,000. The Minister consented to pay the firm $74,000 for work they were already bound by their previous contract to do, and further paid them $65,000 as alleged damages, and claims for extras to the amount of $50,000 were allowed by the Minister.

THE CROSS-WALL CONTRACT.

Thomas McGreevy's brother, Robert, had a 30 per cent. interest in this work and Thomas had a large interest in his brother's finances, because his brother owed him large sums of money and was paying him back out of the profits of these contracts. The amount paid under this contract was $832,448. Four days after this contract was signed the favored firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. subscribed $1,000 to the Sir Hector Langevin testimonial fund. There were five tenders for the work, and of these Larkin, Connolly & Co. were the highest, but two others of the tenders were also put in by Larkin, Connolly & Co., one in the name of Gallagher and another in the name of Beaucage. The tenders were so manipulated, with the connivance of the Department, that the contract was awarded to Larkin, Connolly and Co. This is accounted for by the fact that the treasurer of the Conservative funds in the Quebec district received $25,000 from Larkin, Connolly & Co., as the consideration of their securing the contract. The direct loss to the treasury by the passing over of the tender of Peters and Moore, who were the lowest, was $70,000. In addition to that, Larkin, Connolly & Co. were paid $22,000 to which they were not entitled.

CONTRACT FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE ESQUIMALT DOCK.

Robert McGreevy was given an interest of twenty per cent. of the profits in this work, which was the completion of the graving dock at Esquimalt, British Columbia. Again there was a lot of hocus-pocus work about the tenders. The evidence showed that the Minister of Public Works brought his personal influence to bear upon Starrs and O'Hanly, the lowest tenderers for this work, to induce them to withdraw, and Mr. Starrs swore that Sir Hector threw so many obstacles in his way that he did finally withdraw. On the same day the Minister hurried to council with a report awarding the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co., whose tender was $30,000 higher than that of Starrs and O'Hanly, the figures being $374,559 and $338,945. No sooner had Larkin, Connolly & Co. got the contract than they wanted a change in the length of the dock, the substitution of granite for sandstone, a heavier coursing of stone, and a reduction of the $50,000 which it was agreed they should pay for the plant belonging to the Government already on the work. There was a strict agreement that no reduction of this $50,000 was to be made, but after a while they were allowed a rebate of $20,000. The firm offered Thomas McGreevy $50,000 to have the dock lengthened 100 feet and Sir Hector Langevin sent a report to council advising that the dock should be lengthened 100 feet, and that an Imperial contribution should be applied for, but as the Imperial Government refused the scheme was dropped.

To show how the Minister and contractors worked together in all these matters, the substitution of granite for sandstone is perhaps the best illustration. N. K. Connolly, who was on the work in British Columbia, thought it would be to their interests to have the graving dock built of granite instead of sandstone as provided in the contract. Shortly afterward Michael Connolly wrote that the granite was terribly hard and the quarry 180 miles distant, and strongly advised against any such change. Meantime Nicholas Connolly's request had been complied with in the Department, chief engineer Perley reporting to the Minister in favor of changing from sandstone to granite at an extra cost of $45,000. An Order-in-Council authorizing the change was prepared by the Minister, but then came the news that the firm had changed its mind and did not want the change, and the Order-in-Council was torn up. The request of the contractors that the coursing should be three feet thick instead of one foot was granted on condition that it was to cost nothing extra, but the contractors were afterwards allowed $45,000 for it.

The contractors wanted three-foot masonry instead of one foot because they had discovered a quarry in the locality furnishing three-foot stone and the change was therefor in their own interest, but notwithstanding this the change was used to steal another $40,000 from the public in order that the Government should get back a portion of it to be used for party purposes in the elections.

The cost of the dock when completed was $581,841, being $207,168 more than the amount of the tender. The contractors' profits in this contract amounted to $240,979, in addition to $27,000 paid in "donations," namely, bribery and corruption.

GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION.

The reason why the Government willingly paid so much money to these contractors is shown by the evidence. An extract from the books of the firm showed a charge against the Esquimalt dock of $35,000 in seven different mysterious sums. This money was paid corruptly in return for the favors shewn to the firm by the Government. The sum of $5,000 was given for the Three Rivers election. Three Rivers was the constituency represented by Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works. The Conservative managers relied largely on the contributions of Larkin, Connolly & Co. Mr. Valin, then a member of Parliament, gave this evidence at the investigation:

"I applied again to Mr. McGreevy and to Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy told me: 'We have placed all that is necessary in Mr. McGreevy's hands and we have advised him to help you especially; apply to him and you will get some.' Then, having applied to Mr. McGreevy, he said to, me the elections in the county of Quebec are costing heavily. The Ministers are costing us very heavily and I have no more money to give you. Caron is always after me and I cannot satisfy him with money. We have Sir Hector at Three Rivers and, besides, other counties."

It will, therefore, be seen that Mr. Thomas McGreevy was simply the custodian of these corruption funds, and that the members of the Dominion Cabinet were, with others, the beneficiaries.

Sir Hector Langevin gave an order on Mr. McGreevy, February 2, 1887, for $600 to be spent in Bellechasse; for $200 for the county of Portneuf; for $300 on one occasion and $750 on another for Champlain election; for $500 for Quebec East; for $500 for L'Islet; for $500 for Drummond and Arthabaska; for $200 for Beauce and for $200 for Lotbiniere.

An official list of expenditures in the campaign of 1887 shows that $112,700 was drawn from the reptile fund and expended over a score of Quebec constituencies according to a preconcerted arrangement between Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Adolphe Caron and Hon. Thomas McGreevy. A list of the counties was drawn up and the sum that was to be spent in each was placed opposite. This arrangement is referred to by Sir Hector Langevin in a letter to Mr. McGreevy, dated February 18, in which the Minister says: "You know that Montplaisir (the candidate in Champlain) was to receive altogether $2,000 for his legal expenses."

Larkin, Connolly & Co. were kept busy receiving money from the Dominion Government with one hand and giving a portion of it back to Thomas McGreevy with the other hand.

The expenditure in Quebec county was $18,500; in Three Rivers, $16,800; Quebec West, $8,000. Large sums were paid to the subsidized press.

LANGEVIN'S CLEAR GUILT.

Sir Hector Langevin was Mr. McGreevy's political chief, and it is admitted that Mr. McGreevy squeezed between $150,000 and $200,000 out of these contractors as contributions to the fund of the Conservative party, of which he is the custodian, and it was paid out on orders signed by Sir Hector Langevin himself, including $35,000 which Mr. McGreevy says he paid for *La Monde*, Sir Hector's own personal newspaper organ (Sir Hector thought that the sum paid was only $28,000). Thomas McGreevy admitted that he applied to the firm for the money which Sir Hector Langevin admits he asked Thomas McGreevy for.

In the light of these facts can anyone believe that the Minister of Public Works did not know all about the manner of raising this money, or that he did not lend his influence as a Minister, and his colleagues also, to accomplish their ends? The con-

tractors could only pay out these vast sums to the treasurer of the Conservative party on condition that the Conservative Government allowed them to make that much extra out of the contracts, and something besides for themselves. Thus you find bogus claims set up and allowed, extraordinary prices paid for ordinary work and changes made from time to time in the contracts with the result ot transferring large sums of the public money from the Dominion treasury into the pockets of the contractors.

One of the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., Owen E. Murphy, swore that he went to the house of the Minister of Public Works and laid a little parcel upon the table before him as a present, that the Minister took the parcel and put it into a drawer of the table, that nothing was said further and Murphy went out. That little parcel contained $10,000, Murphy swore.

Sir Hector Langevin accepted $10,000 from Mr. McGreevy, according to the evidence, and he accepted a testimonial of $22,000 in cash, subscribed for the most part by contractors having dealings with the department. The milking of contracts and the squeezing of contractors have been reduced to an art by the present Government, and Sir Hector Langevin was acting for the Government in which he held the second position, and the Government got the benefit of it all.

Sir Adolphe Caron was fully cognizant of the contributions of Larkin, Connolly & Co. He holds the second place in the Bowell Ministry, and is Premier Bowell's trusted ally. Sir Hector Langevin is a member of the Privy Council and a strong supporter of the Government. It is only a few of the small boodlers who have been punished—the clerks under these men. The Government majority in the House of Commons whitewashed Sir Hector Langevin as being ignorant of any wrongdoing.

ONE LAW FOR THE RICH, ANOTHER FOR THE POOR—THE RELEASE FROM PRISON.

In November, 1892, Thomas McGreevy and N. K, Connolly were covicted at the Assizes in Ottawa of conspiracy to defraud the Public and were sentenced by Mr. Justice Rose to one year's imprisonment. The judge said he made the sentence very light. At the expiration of about three months the Government released them on the plea that confinement was injuring their health. As a matter of fact they never looked better in their life, never missed a meal nor lost any weight. They missed their usual exercise in the open air, and the confinement was no doubt irksome to them. Any physician could give a certificate that confinement in goal was prejudicial to a prisoner's health, and so the Government did not want for medical certificates when they asked for them. Mr. Justice Rose, in his charge to the jury, referred to those in high places who might be equally guilty with McGreevy and Connolly, and told the jury that they could only deal with the two defendants before them, no matter whether it was true or not that other persons in high places were equally guilty. The electors of Canada now form the jury to pronounce on all these things. Would a poor women convicted of stealing bread for starving children be liberated before expiry of her sentence?

McGreevy is now a member of parliament and supports the Government.

The Curran Bridge Steal.

In the session of 1892 Parliament voted $170,000, this being the departmental estimate of cost, for a new bridge over the Lachine canal, at Wellington street, in the city of Montreal, and to renew the Grand Trunk bridge alongside. This work was proceeded with during the winter of 1892-93. The chief engineer and other officers of the department and the Minister himself visited the works in the course of construction.

The whole work was under the immediate supervision of the department at Ottawa, and was done by day labor instead of by contract, and it will be seen that as much money can be stolen from the public under the administration of the men now in power at Ottawa under the day labor system as under the contract system.

The outside quantity of timber and lumber which could have been used in the work was 2,594,000 feet b.m., and there was charged and paid for 3,613,000 feet, or a steal of over a million feet, representing at least $15,000 for that item.

The stone-cutting, which could have been done for $6,000 amounted to $40,000. Upon the Wellington street bridge (commonly called the Curran bridge, after the Hon. J. J. Curran, M.P., of Montreal), the cost of stone-cutting by piece work should have

been about $3,000; the amount paid by the Government was $16,715. On the Grand Trunk bridge, what would have cost by piece-work some $3,000, cost the Government $23,180.

The substructure of the Grand Trunk bridge should have cost (according to the estimate of the commissioners appointed by the department to enquire into these matters) $56,000. The pay-list for the labor alone on this substructure, without taking into account material, plant or false works, amounted to $140,000.

The chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. E. P. Hannaford, swore that the Grand Trunk were ready to build the substructure of the Grand Trunk bridge, and on the 28th December, 1892, the willingness of the railway company to build the substructure for $35,000 was sent to the department of railways and canals. As early as October, 1892, the Grand Trunk wrote the department, giving their estimate of the cost of the bridge they were willing to build as $35,000 for the substructure. The estimate for the superstructure, about which there never was any dispute, was $35,000, making the total cost of the bridge as estimated by the Grand Trunk chief engineer, $70,000. Under Mr. Haggart's direction it cost $136,000 for labor alone.

Mr. Hannaford swore that in his estimate of $70,000 he had calculated a profit of $10,000 for the company, leaving the actual cost $60,000.

The original estimate of cost for the substructures of both bridges, allowing for an 18-foot navigation, was $122,000. This was afterwards increased to a 20-foot navigation, for which the total cost was estimated at $160,000. The actual cost of the work was $430,325, of which $394,000 was actually paid over, a steal from the taxpayers, in Mr. Haggart's department, of at least $234,000.

It is estimated that the man who furnished the labor made $150,000 out of the job. This was Mr. E. St. Louis, a cousin of the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, Minister of Public Works, and a prominent Conservative contractor of Montreal. He falsified the pay-lists which contained the names of men who were never employed on the works at all, and there were five time as many men employed as was necessary. It was reported on the 8th March, 1893, that 1,300 men were employed on the work. Mr. St. Louis explained to the Parliamentary committee of investigation that he had to make a good many political subscriptions, and for that reason had to make large profits. He destroyed his books, vouchers and other documents, because there were some entries he did not wish to make public.

It was sworn to that Mr. St. Louis had stated that he gave $1,500 to Mr. Emard, the legal partner of the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, for the Vaudreuil election. That evidence will be found at page 344 of the blue book, 1894.

The whole evidence in this atrocious scandal showed that the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars was due to the neglect, extravagance and mismanagement of the Department of Railway and Canals, presided over by Hon. John Haggart, under whose nose all this stealing took place. There was no Government time-keeper, no proper checks on what was being done; the only man who was exercising any efficient supervision being dismissed at the beginning. This was Mr. Desbarats, an engineer. The overseer of the canal, Mr. Edward Kennedy, who was appointed on the recommendation of the Hon. J. J. Curran, M.P., was bossing the job, and he and Mr. St. Louis had everything their own way. It was because Mr. Kennedy did not wish the interference of Mr. Desbarats that the latter was dismissed by the Government.

Sir Richard Cartwright moved a vote of censure on the department for its conduct of this work; but Mr. Haggart resisted it and every one of his followers supported him. The division list appears on page 6,520 of the Commons Hansard of 1894.

A commission was appointed to report on this contract and they presented a special report to the Government in 1894. Below are some of the facts stated:—

SAMPLES OF CURRAN BRIDGE WAGES, ETC., PAID BY GOVERNMENT.

$4 a day for foreman.
$6 a day for foreman for night or over-time.
$8 a day for foreman on Sunday.
$12 a day for foreman on Sunday, over time.
$5 a day for team.

$10 a day for team on Sunday
$2.50 a day for derrick.
$3.75 a day for derrick for over-time.
$7.50 a day for derrick for overtime on Sunday.
St. Louis puts on all the men he wishes and gets paid for them.
2,000 men on the works at one time.
Large numbers idle.
No Government time-keeper.
No regular count.
No Government foreman.
No Government supervision.
No Government record of men or materials.
No Government classification of labor.
Unskilled labor paid for as skilled labor.
No public tenders for timber.
Inferior timber supplied.
Carter's delivery tickets for lumber, etc., missing.
No checks as to quality of timber and lumber supplied.
Large quantities missing.
New timber burnt as firewood, carted away, stolen, etc.
Government teams haul lumber that contractor was to deliver.
$39,806.04 paid for $6,000 worth of stone cutting.
$16,715 paid for $3,000 worth of stone cutting.
Stone hauled by team 20 miles along railway, running from quarry to works.
Government warned all along of the frauds but allow then to continue.
Pays bills as they come in.
When work completed Government issue commission to investigate.
Pending investigation, Government pays St. Louis balance of $105,000 for wages that Chief Engineer discredited and would not certify to.
Commission unanimously report incompetence, extravagance and fraud.
People's money lost.
No one held responsible.

On page 173 of the Journals of the House of Commons for 1895 is to be found the following amendment to the proceedings, was moved by Hon. L. H. Davies, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright:—"That it appears from the report of the commissioners appointed to investigate the facts connected with the construction, in the year 1893, of the two bridges at Montreal across the Lachine canal; that in the building of the substructures for these bridges the estimates for which were $122,000, the Government has been already actually defrauded of about $160,000, while claims for large amounts for labor and materials, alleged to have been supplied are still unpaid; that the construction of such substructures was carried out by the Department of Railways without calling for public tenders, without proper supervison or check and with a reckless abandonment of business rules which encouraged fraud and wrong-doing; that after knowledge had been brought home to the Ministers and Department of the reckless extravagance which prevailed in the construction of these bridges, no real or effective attempt was made to ensure an honest carrying on of the work, but, on the contrary, enormous sums of money were, after such knowledge, improperly paid to contractors and others, and the door was left wide open for the perpetration of fraud upon the Government; that although the evidence discloses the names of many persons who were parties to these frauds, no attempt has been made to punish any of them criminally except St. Louis; that under these circumstances, the Minister of Railways is responsible and deserves the severest censure of the House for negligence, inefficiency and gross mismanagement in connection with these works, and for the losses the country has sustained."

This was voted down by the Government supporters by a vote of 102 to 65. (See page 178 of the Journals of the House for 1895.)

We will quote from the Montreal *Gazette* of the 14th May, 1895, a statement made by Judge Desnoyers upon the application of the Solicitor-General with respect to the suit against the contractor of the Curran bridge for a refund of money which the Solicitor-

General claimed he had got unfairly from this Government. The Judge said: "There was no proper surveillance by the officers of the Government on two of the jobs at least viz., the Grand Trunk bridge of lock No. 1 ot the Lachine canal. The time-keeping on the two latter jobs seems to have been left to take care of itself, as far as the Government officers were concerned, so much so that two prominent public officers, high in office, lost their situation on that account. Mr. St. Louis procured all the workmen that were asked of him. He did not keep time personally, he had several clerks to do it, and one of them stuffed the lists. This was sworn to by himself, to his own disgrace; and when these lists were so made and cooked they were certified blindly and as a matter of form by the officers of the Government."

The Government has been unable to succeed in its law suit against St. Louis, but on the contrary St. Louis brought action against the Government for payment of the balance of $63,642.29 which he claimed was still due to him and in Hansard for February 24th, 1896, it is recorded that St. Louis was allowed by the Supreme Court, $61,842.29 with interest out of his claim of $63,642.29. He has also been allowed his costs.

The Caron Scandal.

In 1892 Mr. J. D. Edgar, the member for West Ontario charged Sir Adolphe Caron with being a corrupt member of the Administration and asked for a Committee of the House to investigate the charges which Mr. Edgar formulated and declared upon his responsibility as a member of Parliament to be true. The Government first refused point blank to allow any investigation, on the ground that the charges were not specific, but upon Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who was then a supporter of the Government, and others demanding that something should be done, the Government proposed to appoint a royal commission to investigate the charges, first altering the charges to suit the accused. There was no precedent in the British Parliament for refusing a committee to investigate charges of corruption made on the floor of the House, but it is still a fact that it was refused.

Mr. Edgar had ten paragraphs in his indictment, the truth of which he was willing to leave to the judgment of a Committee of the House upon which there should be a Government majority. The Government in refusing an investigation by the House were condemned by their own act. The text of the charges can be seen in the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of 6th April and 4th May, 1892. The Lake St. John Railway is a road in the vicinity of Quebec, which received upwards of one million of dollars as subsidies from the Dominion Parliament. The company which undertook to build the road made a contract with another company, known as the Construction Company, by which the Construction Company became the contractor for the railway and entitled to receive every dollar of Dominion subsidies voted by Parliament. Sir Adolphe Caron was a shareholder of the Construction Company and a director. Subsequently the Construction Company sub-let or assigned the work they had undertaken to Mr. H. J. Beemer, who undertook to build the railway on consideration that the Construction Company transferred to him all unpaid subsidies and gave their bond to use every effort to procure for Mr. Beemer additional Government subsidies. The company which thus piedged itself had Sir Adolphe Caron for a director, and, moreover, when the Construction Company made the contract with Mr. Beemer, Sir Adolphe Caron was present in person. The sum already spent on the road was put down at $450,000, which Mr. Beemer agreed to pay back to the Construction Company out of the bonds and subsidies. In addition to that he agreed to pay Sir Adolphe Caron and his fellow directors and shareholders of the Construction Company $11,000 per annum for office expenses. The whole subscribed stock of the Construction Company was $94,250, so that what Mr. Beemer was to pay them amounted to more than 450 per cent. upon their entire subscribed capital. Subsequently the company applied for subsidies at Ottawa and with Sir Adolphe Caron's assistance got them. In other words the Minister sat in the Cabinet and voted a million dollars of subsidies to a road in which he was financially interested. The president of the Construction Company was the Hon. J. G. Ross, who had large private transactions with Mr. Beemer, who assigned all the subsidies to which the Lake St. John Railway was entitled to Mr. Ross as security for moneys advanced by Ross; thus Mr. Ross was doubly interested in these subsidies both past

and future; interested in Mr. Beemer's financial success as the sub-contractor of the road, and interested in the profits of the Construction Company of which he was president. Mr. Ross and his brother held more than half of the entire stock of the Construction Company, and the evidence was that unless more subsidies were obtained and the road completed the $450,000 due the Construction Company would have been lost. Mr. Ross himself, therefore, would have on this one item have lost $118,000. Mr. Beemer had not a cent's worth of interest in these subsidies, when his arrangement with Mr. Ross was considered.

CARON'S CONFESSION.

Under these circumstances the general elections of 1887 came on and what took place shortly before they were held is shown in the evidence of Sir Adolphe Caron himself, given before the Royal Commission of 1892:

"I had occasion to require some funds for the campaign, and I called on Mr. Ross. I got from him personally an amount which I would not be absolutely precise about, but it was between $5,000 and $10,000 on the first day. From his office I drove up to the office of the Hon. Thos. McGreevy, a witness examined in this investigation. He was one of a committee composed of three, Hon. Sir Hector Langevin and myself being two of the three, and Mr. McGreevy being the third and the treasurer, for the purposes of that campaign. I took the money which I had received from Mr. Ross, and handed it personally to Mr. McGreevy who received it from me. He gave me a receipt for the amount, and in a period of time extending, probably, over seven or eight days, or ten days possibly, I drew out at different periods. The different amounts up to the $25,000 which had been promised by Mr. Ross, through me, I placed in the hands of Mr. McGreevy as I had done the first instalment, and got receipts from him. These amounts were distributed after a discussion between the members of that committee, Sir Hector Langevin, myself and Mr. McGreevy. They were distributed for what we considered to be legitimate and indispensable expenses of the various counties which we were looking after in the district of Quebec.

GROSS CORRUPTION.

Although the prosecutor before the royal commission was an appointee of the accused, and of course avoided asking ugly questions, Sir Adolphe Caron himself had to admit the receipt of $25,000 from the beneficiaries of the Lake St. John Railway. The fund, which reached at least $100,000 for the district, was distributed in part upon the order of Sir Adolphe Caron himself. The Minister was running in Quebec county at that time and his own orders on the fund for Quebec county alone amounted to $5,100. Sir Adolphe Caron did not go to the Minister of Finance at Ottawa and get $5,000 from the public exchequer direct and squander it in corruption, but what he did do was to hand large sums of the public money to the promoters of the Lake St. John Railway and then receive from those who were to be benefited by the Government subsides, a portion of those subsidies for election purposes, handing the money in bank notes to Thomas McGreevy and then drawing it out again upon orders signed by himself. It was a clear case of steal, but Sir Adolphe Caron rather gloried in the fact that he was stealing for the party and not for himself. Speaking in the House of Commons July 3rd, 1894, Sir Adolphe said:

"I take the full responsibility for my action and for assisting my friends, because it was necessary to assist them under the peculiar conditions existing in the district of Quebec, which I was looking after. . . . I am prepared to stand or fall by what I have done, and considering that I have helped my friends to the extent that I have considered legitimate, I say that under the same circumstances what I did on that occasion I would do again to-morrow, in order to help my friends."

Although $18,500 was spent to elect Sir Adolphe Caron in Quebec county, (according to the official list of expenditures from the fund), Sir Adolphe Caron's agent on that occasion, in publishing the return of expenses required by the Statutes swore that the personal expenses of the candidate amounted to $58, and that the expenses of his agent amounted to $846.46; or a total expenditure for the county of $904.46. These were the legitimate expenses, the "legal" expenses so often referred to in the orders on the reptile fund.

Sir Adolphe Caron stated that the fund was merely used to pay the legal expenses of poor candidates. Dr. Landry was the Conservative candidate in Montmagny and a man of wealth; nevertheless he received $1,000 from the fund.

Caron gave many other orders, photographs of which were produced in Parliament by Mr. Edgar, as well as those of some orders signed by Sir Hector Langevin. A copy of the official list of the expenditures in the Quebec district made from the fund in the campaign of 1887 can be seen on page 16 of the Votes and Proceedings and in Hansard of June 15, 1892. The total sum was $112,700.

Caron Whitewashed.

Failing to get a select committee and failing to carry a motion protesting against the substitution of a new set of charges drawn up by the accused or his colleagues, the Liberals, while not recognizing the royal commission, used the evidence given before it, partial as it was, and challenged a verdict from the House upon it March 22, 1893, in the following motion in amendment to the motion to go into supply.

"That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, but that it be declared that in the opinion of this House the evidence taken by the royal commission appointed last session to enquire into certain charges made against the Hon. A. P. Caron, K.C.M.G., M.P., which was reported to the Government on the 24th November last and is now laid before us, established facts which should have prevented the subsequent appointment of Sir A. P. Caron to be an adviser of the Crown and also renders it highly improper that he should continue to hold such office."

This grave censure upon a member of the Government was endorsed and supported by several prominent Conservatives, including Mr. Calvin, Conservative M.P for Frontenac, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, Dr. Weldon, M.P. for Albert, N.B., and Col. O'Brien, M.P., each of whom by this vote declared Sir Aldophe Caron unfit to be a Cabinet Minister. Nevertheless, Mr. Bowell in forming his new cabinet in December, 1894, took Sir Adolphe Caron into his Government.

WHITEWASHED AGAIN. (See Journals of the House, 1893, page 383.)

The last time the matter was brought up in the House (see Journals of the House, page 383), it came up upon the conviction of Thomas McGreevy and N. K. Connolly, who were sentenced by Mr. Justice Rose to one year's imprisonment in the common gaol for conspiracy to defraud the Queen. The following motion was made by Mr. Edgar:

"That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: 'from the public trial and conviction of Thomas McGreevy and N. K. Connolly for conspiracy to defraud, and from evidence and papers already before this House, it appears that large portions of the moneys which were found, upon said trial, to have been criminally received by the said Thomas McGreevy from Government contractors were so received by him for the purpose of being expended in elections in the interest of the Conservative party, and for distribution by Sir Hector Langevin, M.P., and Sir Adolphe Caron, M.P., for the election of themselves and other supporters of the Government at the general elections held in February, 1887.

"That it further appears that large portions of the said moneys, together with other large sums collected by Sir Adolphe Caron from those interested in Government railway subsidies, were expended and distributed by Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron, and in lavish and illegal amounts, to assist in the election of themselves and of other supporters of the Government, in the District of Quebec, at the general elections of 1887.

"That the said Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron were then, and are now, members of this House, and on the roll of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada, and the said Adolphe Caron is a Cabinet Minister and Postmaster-General.

"That in the opinion of this House, the said Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron are deserving of the severest censure for their connection with the said transactions, and that it is a public scandal and an injury to the reputation of Canada that Sir Adolphe Caron should continue to hold the position of a Minister of the Crown."

This motion was voted down by 102 to 65, every Conservative in the House voting against it. Mr. Calvin was not present but was "paired" against it. Dr. Weldon voted against it. Messrs. McCarthy and O'Brien were both absent.

SECTION "B" SCANDAL.

On September 23, 1891, Mr. Lister formulated charges on the floor of Parliament against the Hon. John G. Haggart, Minister of Railways and Canals. He charged that in the year 1879 Messrs. Alexander Manning, Alexander Shields, J. J. Macdonald, Alexander MacDonnell, James Isbester and Peter McLaren entered into a contract with the Government for the construction of a portion of the C. P. R. between Port Arthur and Rat Portage, known as Section "B.," and that Mr. Haggart, who, during the whole period of the contract, was a member of the House of Commons, was beneficially interested in the profit of the contract which accrued to the share standing in the name of Peter McLaren and received large sums out of the profits and otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits from the contract; and that the contractors during the progress of the work made large contributions for political purposes with the knowledge and assent of Mr. Haggart which were charged against the profits of the firm, and that unsettled matters relative to the contract, which were in dispute between the firm and the Government, were at that time, or subsequently, settled in favor of the contractors. Mr. Lister moved for a select committee to examine into these charges and report to the House. The committee named by Mr. Lister in his motion were four Conservatives and three Liberals, or seven in all, having the right to vote.

Mr. Haggart denied the truth of the charges, as had Mr. Rykert, and Mr. McGreevy and Mr. Turcotte, and Sir Adolphe Caron, and others who were subsequently shown to have no defence to the respective charges brought against them, and two of whom were expelled from the House in consequence of the charges being established which they at first denied. Mr. Haggart stated that he had arranged the partnership between Mr. McLaren and the other partners for the purpose of constructing section "B.," and overlooked the carrying on of the contract and the final settlement, but said he got no large sums from McLaren.

In the debate which followed, the Government practically took the stand that it was nothing wrong for public contractors to pay back to the party composing the Government, tens of thousands of dollars for the purpose of debauching and corrupting the electors. Section "B." contract involved over $4,000,000, and was not finished until 1885 or 1886. The Liberals took the ground that if the charges were true Mr. Haggart was not the kind of man to continue to be an adviser of the Crown.

Notwithstanding Mr. Haggart's statement that there was no truth in the charges, and that he could get a declaration from Mr. McLaren in confirmation of his denial, he refused to consent to an investigation, and the Government supported him in that refusal, and every Conservative member at that time in the House voted down the motion for an enquiry, the division being 102 to 78.

THE HARRIS LAND JOB.

The Government purchased a piece of property in St. John, N. B., containing about 216,000 square feet, for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway and paid $200,000.

The land first required was covered by a vote of $80,000, but by a private arrangement, in violation of a pledge which had been given to the House that nothing would be done except by way of legal expropriation, the whole of the Harris property was purchased, 1892, and the sum of $200,000 paid. That this was a sum fully $100,000 in excess of what should have been paid was made very clear. Within a year of the time of the purchase the owners of the land swore that the value was $93,401, and the property was assessed as of the value of $66,000. In the opinion of Mr. Adams, the Conservative member for Northumberland, N.B., the land had been purchased for three times its value. Without going into the details of this job, the language of Mr. Adams in the House of Commons, May 13, 1892, may be quoted. He said:—

"You are to-night committing a public crime. You are trying to force an expenditure upon the people you cannot justify. There is no evidence to justify this Legislature in passing $200,000 for the purchase of this property. No Grit, no Tory, high or low, from the richest to the poorest, could say that $200,000 was the actual price paid by common law, prudence, or justice. It is simply a job. It stands unparalleled in the history of purchases. I am quite clear that this property has been purchased for three times its value, beyond all question."

This was the language not of an opponent but of a supporter of the Government, and one who knew the city of St. John and the property in question.

It was generally understood in St. John that part of the money paid over by the Government, ostensibly for this land, was applied in repayment of election expenses in St. John.

THE TAY CANAL.

The Tay Canal is another example of the spendthrift character of the present Government. In 1882, when a vote for $50,000 was taken for the construction of this canal, which is a ditch running from the Rideau Canal six miles to the town of Perth, the home of the Hon. John Haggart, the Minister of Railways and Canals said that the total cost of the work, exclusive of the cost of the land required, would be $132,660. In 1883 another vote was taken in Parliament, when Sir Charles Tupper stated that the canal would cost $240,000. In that year to justify the vote, and to reply to the protest of the Liberals, Mr. Haggart promised that smelting works would be erected at Perth, which would require this canal. In 1884 another $100,000 was asked, and very little more was heard of the work until the session of 1887, when an additional vote of $55,000 was asked. The Government then stated that the expenditure to date had been $256,000, and that $55,000 would complete the work. In the session of 1888 there was voted an additional sum of $78,000, and in reply to some Opposition criticism the Government said that the work had been finished. The demand for money for "Haggart's Ditch" nevertheless continued, and in 1889 Parliament was asked for a further sum of $25,000 "to complete the work." At that time the total cost was $364,951, or $124,951 more than Sir Charles Tupper told the House in 1883 the total cost would be. In 1890 a further sum was asked of $11,000 for the Tay Canal, and the then Minister of Railways and Canals was again questioned by Sir Richard Cartwright, who made the following sarcastic remark :

"This, I understand, is really a useful work ; it drains the county of Perth."

To which Sir John Macdonald made the following reply :

"If it does not drain the county of Perth it drains the public treasury pretty well."

It was officially stated that this last vote of $11,000 was "to settle with the contractors and finish the Canal." Notwithstanding this, and during the same session, another sum of $20,000 was asked and voted, making the cost so far $440,613, or $200,000 more than the Government assured Parliament at the beginning the work would cost. In the estimates for 1891-92 there appeared a further vote of $30,000 to "complete" the Tay Canal.

This was found to be all the public money that could possibly be spent on this work without actually pouring it into the ditch from a dipper, so an extension of the Canal was undertaken and placed under contract, namely, an extension from the basin in the centre of the town of Perth to a place called Haggart's Mill, an extension not constructed in the public interest, and undertaken without the sanction of Parliament at a cost of $18,466.

Up to date the total sum expended on this work has been about $500,000 ($476,-128), or four times the amount of the original estimate.

According to the official returns the vessels using the Tay Canal consisted of two tugs, one pleasure boat of fifteen tons, two small boats of eight tons each, one scow of thirty tons, and one skiff of one ton. The canal is five and a half feet deep, which justifies the name applied to it of "Haggart's Ditch." The extension of the canal to Haggart's Mill was made for no other purpose than to give the mill a greater head of water.

The annual cost of maintenance, including interest on the capital invested, was about $28,000, or about $4,700 a mile.

The revenue from the Tay Canal amounted in 1891 to the total sum of $58.81, and the revenue for the year 1893 appears to have been *nil*, as no mention is made of it in the Auditor General's report, where the receipts from all the canals appear.

Mr. Haggart defended the expenditure in the House, and claimed that his county was entitled to something.

A motion made by Mr. Cameron, of Huron, that the expenditures on the Tay Canal were in violation of pledges to Parliament, and the extension to Haggart's Mill an unwarranted undertaking, was voted down by 100 to eighty-two, every Conservative in the House voting approval of the expenditure.

The Journals of the House of Commons, Vol. XXVIII., 1894, page 294, is found the following:

Mr. Charlton moved in amendment, seconded by Sir Richard J. Cartwright, That all the words after "that" to the end of the question be left out, and the words "the "first vote of $50,000 for the construction of the Tay Canal was secured from Parliament "in the session of 1882, upon representation made by Sir Charles Tupper that the work "would cost $132,660, exclusive of certain land damages.

"That in the session of 1883 Sir Charles Tupper asked Parliament for a further vote "of $75,000 for the Tay Canal, and stated that the lowest tender received for its construc-"tion was $186,000, but that certain changes had been made, estimated to cost $55,556, "and that the revised estimate of its cost was $240,000.

"That in the session of 1888 Sir Charles Tupper asked Parliament for $78,000 with "which to pay off the balance due to contractors on the Tay Canal, the work having been "finished, and that he then stated that the total cost of the work would be $358,364.

"That the cost of the Tay Canal up to 1st January, 1894, was $476,128.73, or three "and a half times greater than the estimated cost in 1882, and lacking but $3,871.27 of "being double the revised estimate of cost made in 1883.

"That the cost of maintenance of the Tay Canal for the year ending 1st January, "1894, was $2,486.

"That the total receipts from tolls for the year ending 1st January, 1894, were "$135.76.

"That the interest upon the cost of the Tay Canal at the rate of four per cent. per "annum amounted for the year 1893 to $19,045.14; which together with $2,486, the cost "of maintenance for the same year, makes the sum of $21,531.14.

"That to meet this charge of $21,531.14 upon the revenues of Canada for interest "upon investment and cost of maintenance for the year 1893, the Tay Canal yielded for "the same year a revenue of $135.76; the charge for interest upon investment and for "maintenance being 158 times greater than the returns; and the interest yielded upon the "cost of the canal, and the cost of maintenance capitalized at four per cent. being $2\frac{24}{100}$ "cents per $100, or less than one-fortieth of one per cent.

"That the amount of business transacted upon the Tay Canal is of insignificant pro-"portions when contrasted with the cost and capacity of the work, and that the benefits "conferred upon the general public by its construction are comparatively trivial and "unimportant.

"That this House expresses regret that so large a sum as $476,128.73 was expended "in a way that no consideration of sound public money could justify, leaving the country "to suffer, not only the loss of annual interest upon the investment, but a considerable "annual charge in addition if the nearly useless creation of expenditure is maintained. "And that this House is of the opinion that the magnitude of the public debt of Canada "is due, in no inconsiderable degree, to that wasteful and unwarrantable class of expen-"ditures of which the Tay Canal is a type," inserted instead thereof.

This was voted down by the Government supporters.

The Little Rapids Lock—Original Estimate of Cost, $44,000; Actual Cost, $300,000.

In the month of December, 1886, two months before the general election of 1887, the Public Works Department entered into a contract with Mr. W. J. Poupore, Conservative M.P.P. for Pontiac County, Quebec, for the construction of a lock and dam at Little Rapids, on the Lievre river, a stream running through Ottawa county, and discharging into the Ottawa river at Buckingham, twenty miles below Ottawa city. The idea, it is said, was to facilitate the shipment of phosphates; though, as a matter of fact, the effect was to largely increase the cost of phosphates reaching the railway at Buckingham station. Work was not begun until the latter half of 1887, and dragged along until April, 1892, so that it extended over two general elections. After the contract was let, the Department of Public Works extended the work so as to include a guide-wall, a retaining-wall, a cross-wall, and a landing wharf at the lower end. All this additional work was to let to Mr. Poupore without tender, and at greatly increased prices over and above the prices of the original contract.

The original estimate for the work was $44,000, but when the original contract was completed the final estimate made by the department amounted to $76,680, exclusive of the lock gates, which were built of Michigan pine by the Government at a cost of about $10,000. Mr. Poupore, however, has received, so far, $260,000, and has claimed for extras $61,000. If he receives one-half of these extras, the actual cost of the work will be $300,000 for which the original estimate was $44,000, and the final estimate $76,000.

The original contract included nine-tenths of the work finally built, and the cost at Mr. Poupore's own prices of nine-tenths of the work amounted to $76,000, yet on one pretence or another, and for one corrupt reason or another, the Department have paid out $169,000 additional, and as late as the session of 1894 an additional vote of $5,000 was taken on account of this work.

The Galops Channel: Estimate $300,000; Expenditure $900,000.

What is known as the Galops Rapids scandal consists of a scandalous waste of public money in the dredging of a channel on the north side of the Galops Rapids, opposite the electoral district of Dundas, St. Lawrence River. A channel known as the South Channel, already existed and is still used at the present day. The contract for this work was awarded in 1879, when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways and Canals to Denis O'Brien for the sum of $239,750 for a fourteen-foot navigation. Mr. O'Brien withdrawing, the contract was awarded to Messrs. Davis and Sons of Ottawa for the sum of $306,600 for a fourteen-foot navigation. Davis and Sons assigned their contract to Messrs. Gilbert and Sons at Montreal, who were subsequently required by the department to make a seventeen-foot navigation. The contract was entered into August 5, 1879, to be completed in 1881. It was not completed until 1888, when it was taken over by the department, whose engineer reported the work to be completed and stated that it was "two hundred feet wide, thirty-three hundred feet long, straight, and from sixteen and a half to seventeen feet in depth.

Although it was officially reported as completed in 1888, it was officially stated by the Minister of Railways and Canals in the House of Commons in 1894 that it was of no use—that is, that it was not used. The following is extracted from page 3531 of Hansard, 1894.

Mr. Davies: Is this channel used for navigation?

Mr. Haggart: No.

The Minister admitted that up to that date there had been an expenditure of $446,500 and that the contractors had claims amounting to a further sum of $130,000. In order to prove that the department's engineer, Mr. Rubidge, who had the general directions of the work, had given a wrong certificate in certifying that the work had been completed according to contract, the sum of $18,000 was expended in a new survey.

The total expenditure, departmental and contractors, upon this ditch in the St. Lawrence has been about $900,000, and yet the Minister in charge states officially in Parliament six years after the work was taken over as completed, *that no one will use it.*

THE SHEIK'S ISLAND DAM.

The Auditor-General for Canada in his public reports to Parliament took the Government to task for passing an order-in-council on March 26, 1891, authorizing the loan of $60,000 of the public money to Messrs. William Davis and Sons of Ottawa, government contractors. The Auditor-General pointed out that there was no legal authority for such an act, but he was overruled by the Government. The date of this order just three weeks after the general election, and the fact that the Government desired to protest sixty elections, requiring a deposit of $1,000 each, made this extraordinary advance of $60,000 to Davis and Sons a peculiarly suspicious transaction. The Messrs. Davis were the chief contractors for the enlargement of the Cornwall canal, a work still in progress, although the contract provided for its completion April 5, 1891, and they have been paid about a million and a half on account of the work.

It will be seen that Davis and Sons are favorites with the Government, and so the whole scheme of the enlargement of the Cornwall canal was changed in 1893, by which Davis and Sons obtained without tender a new contract worth $384,000 for building what is known as the Sheik's Island Dam. The object of this dam was to convert the north branch of the river into a navigable channel by throwing dams across it at the head and foot of Sheik's Island, forming a deep water basin about three miles long. This basin would form a navigation past sections 6 and 7 of the Cornwall canal, which were under contract to Messrs. Gilbert and Son of Montreal, who had already been paid $125,000, and who were afterwards paid a further sum of $30,000 as damages for the loss of their contract, because sections 6 and 7 were rendered useless by the adoption of the Sheik's Island Dam scheme.

The best engineer that the department ever had, the late Mr. John Page, fully considered the scheme of erecting dams at this point, when the enlargement of the canal was undertaken, and reported in February, 1889, against the scheme, and it was decided not to adopt it.

When this policy was reversed by Mr. Haggart for reasons best known to himself, and when the beneficiaries of the new policy to the extent of the profits on $384,000, were Messrs. Davis and Sons it is not hard to smell a rat. To give Messrs. Davis this new work it was necessary to break the law, which provided that no contract is to be given without tenders being called for.

According to the admissions officially made the public lost $150,000 by the cancelling of the contract to Messrs. Gilbert and Sons; what they will lose by the favoritism shown to Davis and Sons or how much Davis and Sons will contribute to the Conservative campaign fund are matters of conjecture.

A resolution introduced by Mr. Laurier in the House July 3, 1894, reciting the facts and censuring the Government for their course was voted down, every Conservative present voting against it.

The whole management of the Department of Canals of the works on the St. Lawrence has been of an extraordinary character. "Rotten" might be a better word than extraordinary. The Cornwall canal, which is less than twelve miles long, has cost over $5,000,000 to date, and yet in the blue book the superintending engineer says that even after Messrs. Davis get through their already overrun contracts, "the class of vessels for which the enlarged canal is designed will have great difficulty navigating it." The Galops Channel job is quite close to the Cornwall canal, and the millionaire mistakes at these points form the most colossal blundering on record, not even excepting Sir Hector Langevin's record in the Department of Public Works.

THE ST. CHARLES BRANCH.

The St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial Railway branches off from the Intercolonial road to Point Levis, a distance of fourteen miles. When the Government entered upon the project it was estimated to cost $136,000. Up to May, 1894, $1,723,000 had been paid on account of this branch, and there were other outstanding claims amounting, Mr. Haggart said, to $37,719, and the Government were taking at that time a further vote of $17,000. Mr. Haggart stated that the road itself cost $822,000, but that the amount required for land, damages and expenses was over $900,000. It is very evident that the people along the route of the branch were in some cases dealt with very generously by the Government. If they voted right they must have been allowed to claim almost anything they pleased, and although the Government might refer it to arbitration or some other tribunal, they would take care not to make any good defence. The only other explanation of the scandalous expenditure of almost $2,000,000 for fourteen miles of railway is that the Department of Railways has been administered by incompetents, but whether it has been incompetency or corruption the public have had to pay for it.

HOW TO VOTE.

These are but a few of the scandals in connection with the Dominion Government, and the people should show their disapproval of such conduct by voting against Government candidates.